DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 467 RC 023 361

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Traa-Valarezo, Ximena; Reyes, Joel; Alvarez, Lia; Meza, Darlyn; Sanchez, Saul; Traviezo, Jorge; Sabio, Ambrosio; Martinez, Mateo; Figueroa, Luz Maria |
| TITLE | Honduras: Community-Based Education Project. Social Assessment and Indigenous Peoples Development Plan. PROHECO, ADEL and the Intercultural Bilingual Program. |
| INSTITUTION | World Bank, Washington, DC. |
| PUB DATE | 2001-00-00 |
| NOTE | 21p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | For full text: http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Evaluative (142) |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | American Indian Education; *Bilingual Education; *Community Schools; Culturally Relevant Education; Educational Assessment; *Educational Development; Elementary Education; Foreign Countries; *Indigenous Populations; *National Programs; Preschool Education; *Rural Education; School Community Relationship |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Honduras |

ABSTRACT

The New Agenda of the Honduran government proposes the provision of preschool and primary school education for all Honduran children, including those living in isolated areas and in extreme poverty. The Community-Based Education Program (PROHECO) was launched in February 1999, and by December 2000 some 820 schools serving 39,540 students were in operation. This paper reports on a Rapid Rural Appraisal of PROHECO in 49 communities, as well as the Intercultural Bilingual Program (EIB) in indigenous communities. Under PROHECO, the responsibility for preschool and primary education is shared by the State and the civil society, parent/community associations administering the programs are autonomous, and schooling may be conducted provisionally in any appropriate building. The first part of the report discusses the current status of PROHECO schools, the relationship of PROHECO to community social capital, the educational and cultural relevance of instruction offered by PROHECO schools, the creation of community education associations, teachers shortages and perceived risks of becoming a PROHECO teacher, school buildings, accountability, teacher and parent concerns about the new model, and recommendations. The second part of the report presents an overview of the indigenous peoples of Honduras, their languages, and their political and educational history. EIB accomplishments are reviewed, and the first pilot project merging PROHECO and EIB is described. EIB objectives for 2001-2005 are discussed, as well as the needs for bilingual teachers and culturally appropriate curriculum. (SV)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 461 467

# Honduras: Community-Based Education Project. Social Assessment and Indigenous Peoples Development Plan. PROHECO, ADEL and the Intercultural Bilingual Program

Ximena Traa-Valarezo
Joel Reyes
Lia Alvarez
Darlyn Meza
Saul Sanchez
Jorge Traviezo
Ambrosio Sabio
Mateo Martinez
Luz Maria Figueroa

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Feather
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2A

RC 023 361

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Honduras: Community-based Education Project**
**Social Assessment and Indigenous Peoples Development Plan**

Link to Project Information Documents

**November 2000 - January 2001**
**The World Bank**

**Honduras: Community-based Education Project**
**Social Assessment and Indigenous Peoples Development Plan**

## PROHECO, ADEL AND THE INTERCULTURAL BILINGUAL PROGRAM

Research Team

Ximena Traa-Valarezo, Joel Reyes, Lia Alvarez, Darlyn Meza, Saúl Sánchez
Jorge Traviezo, Ambrosio Sabio, Mateo Martínez, Luz María Figueroa

Index
Page

Introduction 2

**Part I: PROHECO, ADEL AND PRESCHOOLS** 3

1. Situation of PROHECO schools to December 2000
2. PROHECO and the social capital of communities 4
3. Pertinence of PROHECO: social, economic and geographic
4. Community Participation, parents' perception of PROHECO, and the Creation of Asociaciones Educativas Comunitarias (AECOS) 5
5. Shortage of teachers in the school system
6. Perceived risks of becoming a PROHECO teacher/community 6
7. Additional demands by the PROHECO teacher
8. Assessment of the infrastructure of PROHECO schools
9. Supervision system and education quality control 7
10. Rapid Appraisal of Preschool Education
11. Local Education Development Associations (ADELs) and School Education Projects (PECs) 8
12. Recommendations

**Part II: Indigenous Peoples Development Plan (IPDP)**

Introduction. The Multi-cultural and Multi-lingual Population of Honduras 9

1. Profile of the Beneficiaries and their Federations 10
2. Social Stratification 12
3. Education Authorities
4. Traditional Authorities

RC023361





BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. The demand for a culturally-appropriate bilingual program
6. Accomplishments of EIB in the Educational System of Honduras 13
7. The Case of Mosquitia and Bay Islands 14
8. The First Pilot Project PROHECO-EIB in Montaña de la Flor 15
9. The Proposed Intercultural Bilingual Program 2001-2005
10. Objectives of the Proposed Intercultural Bilingual Program 16
11. Institutional Arrangements of PRONEEAAH and EIB at the SE
12. Socio-Cultural Pertinence of PROHECO for EIB Schools
13. Cultural Heritage and a Culturally-appropriate EIB Curriculum
14. Imperative Need of Trained Bilingual Teachers for EIB 17
15. Lessons Learned from Attempts to Implement EIB at the national Level
16. Recommendations
17. Indigenous Peoples Development Action Plan 18

**Tables**

Table 1: Current State of PROHECO Schools
Table 2: Autochthonous Population of Honduras and Location
Table 3: Inventory of Educational Texts and Materials Developed, and Others
Needed for the EIB Program
Table 4: Action Plan for the Intercultural Bilingual Program 2001-2005

**Box**

Box 1: Autochthonous Federations of Honduras, December 2000.

**Honduras: Community-based Education Project**
**Social Assessment and Indigenous Peoples Development Plan**

## PROHECO, ADEL AND THE INTERCULTURAL BILINGUAL PROGRAM

### Introduction

The *New Agenda* of the Honduran Government proposes the provision of preschool and primary school education for all Honduran children, including those living in isolated areas of the country and in extreme poverty conditions. To this end, under a loan financed by the World Bank, the Community-based Education Program PROHECO was launched in February 1999. By December 2000, some 820 schools were running for 39,540 students with 1,109 teachers. The present assessment is a joint effort of the Government of Honduras and the World Bank team (November 2000), and it includes a Rapid Rural Appraisal of PROHECO, ADEL and the Intercultural Bilingual Program in 49 communities of 11 departments.

The Rapid Rural Appraisal was conducted in November 2000 by four teams of social scientists and education specialists deployed to 49 communities in 19 municipalities nationwide. The sampled communities visited are located in the departments of Santa Barbara, Copan, El Paraíso, Francisco Morazán, Olancho, Valle, Choluteca, Atlántida, Colón, Gracias a Dios and Bay Islands. Focus groups were conducted in all the communities with teachers, parents, Boards of Directors of AECOs, students and the Indigenous Federations. Interviews were carried out with school principals, Department and District Directors, Mayors and members of Municipal Councils, NGOs working on education, and indigenous authorities. The purpose of the

assessment was to consult with stakeholders on their perceptions of (i) the effectiveness and cultural appropriateness of delivery of PROHECO (basic education, preschool) and community-based preschool CEPENF program, (ii) the appropriateness and demand of ADEL (Education Development Associations) to be introduced with this project, (iii) the introduction of EIB in traditional schools, and (iv) the creation of PROHECO-EIB schools. Information was triangulated for accuracy.

Several assessments have been made by the Education Quality Measurement Unit (UMCE) PROHECO: A un Año de Esfuerzos Iniciales. Secretaría de Educación de Honduras. 2000., the World Bank team PROHECO. Una Estrategia de Eficiencia y Participación Comunitaria. Banco Mundial. 1999., PNUD/CEPAL PROHECO. La Gestión Comunitaria de la Educación Rural en el Proyecto. Estrategia, Avances y Retos. Banco Mundial. 1999., the Agency for Personal Service Overseas (APSO) O'Duffy, Molly. EIB. Bilinguismo, Interculturalidad y Educación Indígena. Agency for Personal Service Overseas (APSO), Ireland. 2000. of Ireland and by independent consultants, to assess the impact of PROHECO not only in terms of coverage, drop-out, and repetition rates, but also in terms of cultural appropriateness, teacher's attendance rates, academic scheduling, and parents' and teachers' satisfaction.

The social assessment recommends mid-term impact evaluations of the different programs (ADEL-PECs, EIB) in 2003, and an impact evaluation of PROHECO by December 2001. An education census being conducted by UNDP nationwide is expected to provide useful data on the current status of education in Honduras by the end of January 2001. The impact evaluations could try to measure not only equity (education for all), efficiency (student and teacher performance, student age-appropriateness), and cost-effectiveness relative to remoteness (students, teachers), but also the social capital promoted by the decentralized community-based PROHECO, ADEL, EIB in the beneficiary communities.

The Social Assessment will have two parts. The first one will discuss the qualitative results of the Rapid Rural Appraisal with regard to PROHECO, ADEL, and preschool education. The second part will focus on the Intercultural Bilingual Program, to conclude with an Indigenous Peoples Development Plan for the implementation of EIB at the national level.

## PART I: PROHECO, ADEL AND PRESCHOOLS

PROHECO was created under Executive Agreement No. 008-98, PROHECO to improve the quality of preschool and primary education by means of a community-based service modality targeted to children deprived from education services due to geographic remoteness or socio-economic marginalization. Under this modality, the responsibility of child education would be shared by the State and the civil society. The program administration would be the responsibility of the parents through the Community Education Associations (AECO), which would enjoy autonomy and legal personality. In terms of infrastructure, PROHECO would have the flexibility to operate provisionally in any appropriate school setting including private homes, community rooms, churches, etc. until permanent buildings would be provided.

### 1. Situation of PROHECO Schools, to December 2000

To-date, eight hundred-twenty (820) PROHECO schools operate in 190 municipalities nationwide. Three hundred eighty-six (386) of those include preschool, and two hundred eighty-one (281) include up to sixth grade. PROHECO schools provide education to 40,000 children, and employment to 1,109 teachers. There are three hundred fifty-nine (359) AECOs formed to start new schools for 13,000 other children, however, they can not operate yet due to lack of teachers. The teacher-student ratio in PROHECO schools is of 36 students per teacher. According to PROHECO Education Statistics , 68% of students recruited start in first grade despite over-age; student desertion rate is greater in first grade (6.5%) and on a declining scale to sixth grade (3.3%); over-age rate of 75% is the same as in the traditional rural system.

**Table 1: Current State of PROHECO Schools**

| Department | Schools operating | AECOS not operating | Schools with Preschool | Schools with sixth grade | PROHECO Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Atlantida | 2 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Colon | 6 | 37 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Comayagua | 89 | 18 | 45 | 37 | 127 |
| Copan | 59 | 26 | 16 | 13 | 73 |
| Cortes | 37 | 18 | 15 | 23 | 65 |
| Choluteca | 65 | 9 | 57 | 45 | 113 |
| El Paraiso | 84 | 10 | 36 | 16 | 92 |
| Fco Moraza | 51 | 18 | 26 | 17 | 56 |
| Intibuca | 73 | 11 | 25 | 20 | 122 |
| La Paz | 40 | 3 | 28 | 17 | 64 |
| Lempira | 68 | 34 | 25 | 21 | 102 |
| Ocotepeque | 64 | 12 | 51 | 15 | 73 |
| Olancho | 91 | 94 | 27 | 20 | 94 |
| S Barbara | 23 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 24 |
| Valle | 19 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 35 |
| Yoro | 49 | 45 | 13 | 18 | 61 |
| TOTAL | 820 | 359 | 386 | 281 | 1109 |

Source: PROHECO en Cifras, Secretaría de Educación. 2000

**2. PROHECO and the Social Capital of Communities**

Consultations with communities indicate that this community-based education system strengthens the social network of civil society. The fact that the school is in the village is said to have improved the security, physical and mental health of students, parents and teachers. Before PROHECO, children faced risky situations (rivers, cliffs, mud slides, theft, rapes) when walking up to 8 Km per day to access a school. Children took a lunch box consisting of few flour tortillas with salt, as they could not go back home for lunch. With PROHECO, significant bonds are created as parents and teachers team up to support the students. Parents of PROHECO school children are more involved in school life, and express more interest in the teacher's performance than in the traditional schools, where parents place all the responsibility of the children's education in the hands of the teacher.

The system allows for the democratization of education. The fact that most PROHECO teachers live in the community is an important safeguard to the continuity of the school program. It's the parents' perception that their children are learning more in PROHECO schools because they receive a fuller class schedule and more attention from the teachers. Likewise, PROHECO teachers feel they receive more attention and support from the parents, students and the community, than teachers in traditional settings. The strengthening of the educational network of stakeholders in the community contributes to increase the social capital of the community.

**3. Pertinence of PROHECO: social, economic, and geographic**

The Rapid Rural Appraisal surveyed the perceptions of teachers, parents, school principals in communities with PROHECO schools operating, to compare them with communities with traditional public schools. One of the areas of analysis was the educational and cultural pertinence of education offered by the school. The community involvement demands a quality curriculum that is more pertinent to the immediate needs of remote farmer communities where PROHECO operates. PROHECO parents and teachers celebrate the fact that they are responsible for purchasing the educational materials needed. This contrasts with all the schools visited in Mosquitia, Bay Islands, Colon and Atlantida where complaints were heard about the absence of school materials that were supposed to be delivered by the School District's offices to traditional schools in 2000. The present social assessment recommends to start the implementation of PROHECO in Mosquitia and Bay Islands, and to increase the coverage of PROHECO schools in other isolated areas in the country.

**4. Community Participation, Parents' Perception of PROHECO, and the Creation of Asociaciones Educativas Comunitarias (AECOs)**

Interviews with Mayors indicated their support to PROHECO. Some municipalities have provided financial contributions for the construction of a school, or for the improvement of the road so that the teacher may have better access to the school. Their expectations are that higher educational standards will bring about better incomes for the families. Focus groups with parents throughout the country indicate a high degree of satisfaction with PROHECO. Parents see teachers' punctuality and high attendance as the major difference between PROHECO and traditional schools. In many schools, parents would like to get more involved, but it is not clear to neither parents nor AECOs, what is the extent of the participation allowed by the program. The social assessment recommends new training workshops for AECOs and community members with regards to participation opportunities, limitations and rules for effective collaboration, not only for organizing social events (Mothers' Day, holidays) for fund raising, but also for participating in curriculum design and selection of school materials. In some communities, mothers are organized to contribute to the teacher's room and board, providing systematic or occasional meals

No major issues were heard from the AECOs, as the disbursement mechanisms put in place to-date work to their satisfaction. For the introduction of PROHECO in the two new departments (Gracias a Dios and Bay Islands), careful provisions should be made particularly in the case of Mosquitia to allow AECOs to receive reimbursements timely. The absence of commercial banks in some areas in the country is an important issue to consider for the creation of PROHECO schools, as other provisions must be made for the efficient functioning of those schools.

**5. Shortage of Teachers in the School System**

All the PROHECO communities support and protect their teachers to the extent of providing shelter and food to them if necessary, to keep them contented. To November, 2000, the total number of AECOs organized (1,179), trained (1,088), with legal personality (1,178), having signed an agreement (1,158), by far exceed the number of schools actually operating. There are 359 AECOs organized in the year 2000 in different municipalities of 12 departments of Honduras, with approximately 13,000 children who can not attend their school because of shortage of teachers Information provided by PROHECO Technical Unit. November, 2000. identified by communities. Such shortage is more serious in Departments which do not have a *Normal* which graduates teachers (i.e. Copan). An effort is being made by the SE to identify trained non-accredited teachers (for basic ed) and volunteers (for preschool) in order to provide them with on-the-job training and a certification in Continuing Education (PFC).

**6. Perceived Risks of Becoming a PROHECO Teacher/ Community**

As PROHECO is a young program, the research team found throughout the country ( i.e. Monte de los Negros, Copan; Limonal and Batalla, La Mosquitia; and Bay Islands) perceived risks derive from lack of sufficient information with regard to the rights and duties of teachers, parents, and community. Fears and suspicion are planted by Teachers' Unions (Colegios Magisteriales) with regard to the "privatization" of education through PROHECO, instability of the program, insecurity for teachers, and unequal access to benefits of Imprema, loans and retirement. Teachers' Unions feel threatened by the autonomy of PROHECO schools. Although salaries are regulated for all teachers in the country, the retirement plan Imprema applies only to teachers under contract. Job instability derives from the fact that PROHECO teachers do not have job permanency, but one-year renewable contracts (including all benefits). Research countrywide showed that, if given a choice, Honduran workers prefer to earn lower wages so long as they enjoy permanency. Permanent unionized teachers feel protected by the Union. Despite the above fears, it is widely recognized that the PROHECO teacher is more enthusiastic about teaching than the traditional one as he/she feels the PROHECO system allows for creativity, innovation, and community involvement.

**7. Additional demands by the PROHECO teacher**

Additional demands refer to venues to increase their income. In order to improve salary conditions, several PROHECO teachers interviewed would like the opportunity to teach another session during the day. At this point, this is not possible. However, the Secretariat of Education will look into this issue.

**8. Assessment of the Infrastructure of PROHECO schools**

The temporary buildings where most schools started operations are being replaced by schools built by the Social Investment Fund (FHIS). To December 2000, 532 Information provided by FHIS Project Information System (SIGES), December 2000. schools have been built and furnished or are under contract in 13 departments, benefiting 22,000 children. As the weather varies in different parts of the country, the pertinence of FHIS's standard model has been questioned in some communities located on regions

of either extremely cold or hot weather, as the large windows are not suited for cold weather (under 15 degrees Centigrade), and zinc roofs not appropriate for zones with 35+ degrees Centigrade and high precipitation indexes.

**9. Supervision, education quality control**

Multi-grade education is not viewed as a major problem, provided that the teacher has adequate training to teach multi-grade school, and there is enough room(s) for grade-groups. In many regions of the country this is the only known setting. The need for teacher training and quality control systems are viewed by teachers and parents as bigger issues to be resolved. The present assessment recommends a standard evaluation system of student and teacher performance be put in place. The need for a revised basic curriculum is imperative. Department and District Directors, teachers and parents need training in education quality maintenance.

Drop-out rates are high in regions where people practice seasonal migration for agricultural activities. Parents and teachers request the SE to reschedule school year to accommodate seasonal demands.

**10. Rapid Appraisal of Preschool Education**

Only 32% of preschool-age children (3 ½ to 6 ½) have access to preschool education in Honduras Preeschool Education Team. Participatory Rural Appraisal, Nov. 2000.. Approximately half of the preschool centers are considered *formal* and the other half are community-based (CEPENF and CCIE) centers operating in rural and peri-urban areas considered *informal*. Teacher unavailability for both modalities is a threat to the system. Some of the major issues pointed out by the social assessment is the lack of up-dated information, quality controls, and supervision systems at the SE.

The preschool education team visited 33 preschools in 11 municipalities in the departments of Francisco Morazán, Choluteca and Valle. Those interviewed include 31 parents, 27 teachers, 41 students and 18 community members. The SA team visited 13 CEPENFs, 7 Kinder Gardens (previously CEPENF) and 4 PROHECO schools that include a preschool section.

The 'informal' nature of CEPENFs is a systemic problem. The education community requests CEPENFs as well as teachers be granted 'formal' status. The community-based centers CEPENF are organized and managed by teachers, volunteers chosen by the community, community groups, Community-based organizations, NGOs (World Vision, Reitoca y Curaren, Christian Fund), churches, District boards, District coordinators. Supervision and quality controls are the responsibility of the SE. Most of the financing comes from religious organizations (i.e. Christian Fund) and from the Municipalities on a smaller scale. Most CEPENFs operate in buildings built with sponsors' funds and community labor.

There is resentment with the SE with regard to the lack of respect for CEPENF volunteers. In 2000 the SE decided to grant legal status to CEPENFs by turning them into Kinder Gardens. To that effect, the SE deployed one thousand *formal* teachers to take over slots occupied by volunteers. Thus, volunteers with 3-5 years experience were displaced and left jobless.

There is concern among teachers about the value of CEPENF Certificates

provided to teachers after a 10-day training (5 modules of two days each) session, as the certificate does not grant them *official* teaching status. Training is thus considered insufficient. Most CEPENF volunteers who have received training from the SE or from other organizations seek to be close to first grade teachers from whom they may receive support. For the latter and other reasons, most parents and teachers request preschools be attached to primary schools.

The perceived benefits of CEPENFs override the existing problems. Parents and teachers compare children who attended preschool with those who did not and conclude communities will continue to support CEPENFs, and will continue to request support from the SE.

The research team observed that the PROHECO preschool model presents several advantages over the other models. Teacher selection by the community and procurement of school supplies by the AECO are important assets. As the teacher's salary is paid by the SE, financial stability is not a concern. Having the immediate support from the PROHECO teachers and the AECO provides support in conflict resolution. Drop-out and absentism rates are lower in PROHECO preschools teachers than in traditional schools.

**11. Local Education Development Associations (ADEL) and School Education Projects (PECs)**

One of the problems identified by teachers and school principals for meeting their educational goals is the unavailability of timely financial resources to develop school projects. The present project proposes the organization of school governments through the creation of Associations for Local Education Development (ADELs). The purpose of the component would be to improve the management capacity of traditional schools to plan education improvement, and administer financial transfers for such activities. The Rapid Rural Appraisal consulted with communities nationwide on the pertinence of the proposed ADELs program. Communities were consulted on the strategies and mechanisms that would be needed to decentralize financial resources directly to the ADEL for the implementation of a demand-driven education project (Community Education Project, PEC) to be prioritized by the community as part of their Annual Education Plan. There was general consensus in the 49 communities consulted on the pertinence of this program which would provide the education community (school Principal, teachers, parents, representative of student council, and local authorities) the opportunity to work together towards solving immediate needs, with financing (incentives) of US$100.00 per project. The Social Assessment recommends the ADEL bonus may be offered to communities not as a gift but as a reward based on performance. A community contribution in kind may be required.

**12. Recommendations**

1. Community-based education at the primary and preschool levels seems to be the most appropriate for rural Honduras. It provides rural, isolated communities with the training, tools and mechanisms for administration of education. The social assessment recommends a major impact evaluation be carried out, where results of PROHECO education are compared with those of the traditional system.
2. Integrated Basic Education. Parents, teachers and other education stakeholders recommend preschools be built attached to primary schools, as

proximity improves teacher and student socialization, security, academic continuity, quality control and supervision. Moreover, Basic Centers (preschool-primary-middle school) are highly sought by communities for the reasons stated above.

3. Project Launch and an Information Dissemination Campaign. A campaign will be needed to show support to PROHECO, ADEL, PECs, EIB programs by the government in transition. Such campaign must disseminate basic information on the benefits of each program and the strategy to access those benefits. The campaign could be done in Spanish and the ethnic languages. The PROHECO campaign should address issues such as: job stability, teachers' rights and benefits (i.e. Imprema, access to loans, on-the-job-Training Programs), community participation for the improvement of the quality of education.

4. Teacher Incentives. Since job security is a major issue, a package of incentives for PROHECO teachers is needed to stimulate educators. I.e. On-the-Job teacher training programs are needed for teacher certification of non-accredited teachers for primary as well as preschool levels. Refresher courses must be provided to certified teachers where multi-grade education is a main topic of training. Study tours and scholarships are incentives for consideration.

5. A training refresher must be given to all the 800 AECOs formed and running on the "multigrade education", rules of PROHECO, teacher benefits, opportunities, and social capital indicators promoted by the community-based program.

6. It's recommended that teachers may be allowed to teach another session in the same village, to improve their income. Some teachers are already working a second shift on a voluntary basis, without pay.

7. A monitoring and evaluation system which assesses student and teacher performance in PROHECO schools and CEPENF centers needs to be put in place to collect and systematize information, i.e. whereas over-age is a general problem in PROHECO and traditional primary schools, under-age (-3 yr olds accompanying older siblings) continues to be a problem for CEPENF centers.

8. Financial sustainability of CEPENFs needs to be addressed. Centers depend on financial aid of volunteer organizations. Community training on becoming self-sufficient is recommended.

## PART II: Indigenous Peoples Development Plan (IPDP)

### Introduction. The Multi-cultural and Multi-lingual Population of Honduras

The population of Honduras is multi-cultural and multi-lingual, and the Honduran government (assisted by the World Bank) is committed to respond to this reality. The geographic isolation of autochthonous peoples (indigenous and Afro-Honduran) contributes to self-exclusion and poor access to services, resulting in low levels of health and education and extreme poverty conditions (see Poverty Map of Honduras 2000). The autochthonous population of Honduras corresponds to approximately 12.7% of the total population according to the 1995 census, and to 16% according to the Indigenous Federations in 2000. The new census in 2001 will clarify population estimates.

**Table 2: Autochthonous Population of Honduras and Location**

| Ethnic group | P. Census 1988 | Pop Federations 1997 | Pop Federat Aug, 2000 | # of communities | Location |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lenca | 174,512 | 292,000 | 440,000 | 700 | Lempira, Intibucá, La Paz, Comayagua, Ocotepeque, Francisco Morazán, S Bárbara, Copán, Valle. |
| Garífuna | 132,150 | 250,000 | 300,000 | 46 | Cortés, Atlántida, Colón, G a Dios. |
| Misquito | 29,994 | 40,000 | 80,000 | 6 federat | Gracias a Dios |
| Tolupanes | 96,946 | 35,000 | 45,000 | 29 | Yoro, Francisco Morazán |
| Creole | 16,208 | 32,000 | 12,600 | 1 | Islas de Bahía, Atláantida |
| Chortí | 12,859 | 5,000 | 8,000 | 37 | Copán, Ocotepeque |
| Pech | 39,369 | 2,672 | 3,200 | 12 | Olancho, Colón, Gracias a Dios |
| Tawahkas | 419 | 1,746 | 1,500 | 5 | Olancho, Gracias a Dios, Margen Río Patuca, Biósfera, Río Plátano. |
| Nahoas | * | * | 12,000 | 32 | Catacamas, Guata |
| | 504,445 | 658,418 | 904,300 | | |

* The existence of the Nahoas was unknown until 1998 when the group claimed their identity and organized as a federation. In the past, the Nahoas were counted as a branch of the Lencas.

**1. Profile of the Beneficiaries and their Federations**

It is important to keep in mind that the nine autochthonous federations in Honduras are of three different origins Rivas, Ramón. Pueblos Indígenas y Garífuna de Honduras. Editorial Guaymuras. 1993.: (i) Mesoamérican Maya-Azteca origin, for the Lenca, Chortí and Nahoa; (ii) African origin, for the Garífuna, Isleños (Creole); and South American Chibcha, for the Pech, Tolupanes (Xicaques), Tawahkas, and Miskitos.

**The Lencas**. It's the largest group (440,000) located in the departments of Intibucá, Lempira and La Paz, with some small groups in Comayahua, Francisco Morazán and Valle. Famous for fighting the Spanish conquerors. History tells of how the invincible Cacique Lempira (Lord of the Land) revealed against conquerors and marched against them in 1573. The lenca lost their native language at the beginning of the XX century. The Lencas are referred to as "farmers of Lenca tradition".

**The Chortí**. They have been identified as the farthest South Maya-Quiché

speakers of *chol.* They inhabit the area of Copán Ruinas, which was one of the most important ceremonial sites of the Maya civilization. The colonial institutions (*encomienda* and *repartimientos*) decimated the Chortí, leaving the present Chortí isolated from their Guatemalan roots.

**The Nahoas**. Until 1998, the Nahoa population was unknown. Under the World Bank financed Program *Nuestras Raíces*, the community organization of the federations invited the Nahoas to declare their true origin, thus forming a new federation FINAH.

**The Garífuna**. They inhabit the Atlantic Coast, between Belice and Nicaragua. They originate in the survivors of 1655 British shipwrecks by San Vicente Island. Until 1797 they lived with the Caribes and learned their language *igñeri,* but that year they were expelled by the British to Roatán and the coast. The Garífunas populate from Masca, department of Cortés, to Plaplaya, department of Gracias A Dios. Their subsistence traits reveal a multicultural background of 300 years: (i) *arawaka carib culture* (Guayanas and Amazona basin); (ii) African background; and (iii) Spanish heritage.

**The English-speaking Black Isleños (creole)**. Their records go back to the XVIII century. They live in Bay Islands and Atlántida. Their main occupation is fishing and services for tourism. For the past two centuries, they have close ties to the United States, as migration into the US was very common until the 1980s. The cost of living doubles that of the continent, and unemployment is the norm. Extreme urban poverty is camouflaged in slams and ghettos located next to tourist (i.e.resorts 150 communities in Santa Elena). There is great demand for PROHECO schools by the communities.

**The Miskitos**. They live in the department of Gracias A Dios. Historians coincide in that Miskitos descend from South American chibcha tribes. They resulted around the XVII century from an inter-racial mix of Bawinkas, Tawahkas (Sumos), African black (shipwrecked at the Cayos Mosquitos in 1641) and Europeans. Newson, Linda. "La población indígena de Honduras bajo el régimen colonial. Mesoamérica. Centro de Investigaciones Regionales de Mesoamérica, Cuaderno 9, June 1985 From 1502 to the XVII century both Spanish and British attempts to conquer the Moskitia failed. Floyd, Troy. The Anglo-Spanish Struggle for Mosquitia. New Mexico: U. of N.M. Press. 1967)

The Miskito are the largest group inhabiting the Moskitia. They live in coastal towns, along rivers and lakes: (i) the 84 villages (97% rural) on the coast have chibcha characteristics, they speak Miskito and follow the Morava religion; (ii) those by Brus Laguna speak Spanish, are of European origin and follow the Baptist Church; and (iii) those on the lowlands speak English and are of African origin. The majority of Miskito are monolingual *miskito*.

**The Tolupanes**. Also called *Xicaques*. They live in the departments of Yoro (Yorito, El Negrito, Morazán, Victoria and Olanchito), and Francisco Morazán (Orica and Marale). Some historians claim they are of chibcha origin living in the area for 5,000 years Wolfgang, Víctor. "The Jicaque (Torrupán) Indians of Honduras". Museum of the American Indian, New York, 1943, pg. 1041. The most ancestral group is on the Montaña de la Flor, where close to 300 speak *'tol'*.

**The Pech**. They inhabit the departments of Olancho, Colón and Gracias A

Dios. There are some Pech groups living by the biosphere of Plátano river. They speak the *pech* language. Some Pech teachers have written the Pech grammar and teach self-managed bilingual education.

**2. Social Stratification**. The social organization of the autochthonous peoples is key to understand why a decentralized program like PROHECO or EIB would work well for ethnic communities. All community organizations are organized around the extended family network where "mutual help" or "mano vuelta" persists. All other community-based programs work better in rural settings than in urban ones.

**3. Education Authorities**. Communities recognize the Departmental and Distrital Directors as the highest education authorities. Communities are willing to collaborate with them provided that participation is sought and promoted by the GOH.

**4. Traditional Authorities**
Ø The Cacique. In communities such as the Pech and Miskito, the cacique is the traditional authority which presides the Tribal Assembly and represents it in the region. The cacique is the advisor to the Assembly. The *cacicazgo is hereditary and for a lifetime.* Among the Tolupanes, the Consejo Directivo de Tribus is the main authority.
Ø Witchdoctors and Zukías (shamans) part-take in decision making in the community, particularly in health issues.

**Box 1: Autochthonous Federations of Honduras, December 2000**

Federations inside Confederación Nacional de Pueblos Autóctonos de Honduras
CONPAH

COPINH Consejo Cívico de organizaciones Populares Indígenas de Honduras.
OFRANEH Organización Fraternal Negra Hondureña
NABIPLA Native Bay Islanders Professionals and Labourers Association

Federations outside CONPAH, grouped under the MESA INDIGENA

ONILH Organización Nacional Indígena Lenca de Honduras
CONIMCHH Consejo Nacional Indígena Maya Chortís de Honduras
FETRIPH Federación de Tribus Indígenas pech de Honduras
MASTA Moskitia Asia Takanka
FINAH Federación Indígena Nahuas de Honduras
FETRIXI Federación de Tribus Xicaques de Yoro

**5. The demand for a culturally-appropriate bilingual program**

The nine ethnic groups from largest to smallest are: Lenca, Garífuna, Miskito, Tolupán, Creole English, Nahoa, Chortí, Pech, and Tawahka. The language of the Lencas (pop. 440,000) belonged to the Mayan Family of languages, and slowly disappeared in Honduras at the turn of the century. The largest linguistic family is the garífuna (pop. 300,000 in Colón, Atlántida, Gracias a Dios, Bay Islands) followed by the Miskito (pop. 60,000 mostly in Gracias a Dios) and the Creole English (pop. 28,000 Data provided by NABIPLA, November 2000.). The large majority of Garífuna, Miskito and Creole speak their native language, and along the departmental borders they may be trilingual (Miskito-Garífuna-Spanish or

Garífuna-Spanish and Creole English).

The Intercultural Bilingual Program (EIB) is a subcomponent of the Basic Education Program of PROMEB. It seeks to respond to the special socio-cultural needs of nine autochthonous groups of Honduras. The first intercultural bilingual experience arose in Mosquitia in 1948 when Reverend Werner Marx of the Morava mission elaborated teaching materials Misquito-Spanish. A separate noteworthy effort is that of Royce de Dennis at the Montaña de la Flor, who created a pilot bilingual program. Unfortunately, both efforts failed to develop as the Secretariat of Education introduced formal education in Mosquitia and Francisco Morazán and disregarded EIB in the '80s. The other groups have also made separate attempts to systematize bilingual programs to preserve the languages, cultural heritage and identity of their communities. Most efforts had no resonance until 1994, when Honduras ratified ILO's Article 169 on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Tribal Groups. Upon the latter ratification, the Confederation of Autochthonous Peoples of Honduras (CONPAH) signed an agreement with the GOH to institutionalize EIB, create a technical unit at the Secretariat of Education, and establish the general guidelines for EIB for Miskito and Garífuna speaking regions.

**6. Accomplishments of EIB in the Educational System of Honduras**

In 1995, the GOH requested support of the World Bank for the implementation of EIB as part of the component Improvement of the Quality of Education (Credit 2694-HO). The National Program of Autochthonous Education (PRONEEAAH) was officially created in 1998, and a plan was drawn for (i) training of Garífuna and Miskito teachers, and (ii) systematization of the grammar of Garífuna, Miskito, Tol, and Chortí languages, and linguistic agreement of standard forms (phonetic, syntactic and semantic). Indigenous teachers and leaders participated in the First Congress on Intercultural Bilingual Education in Guatemala (1996) and a Workshop on Sumo (Tawahka-Panamahka) language in Nicaragua (1998). Despite the initial accomplishments mentioned above, EIB is not widely recognized as an SE program yet. As a joint effort of the GOH and the WB team, an Indigenous Peoples Development Plan has been agreed on, to create an EIB program accredited by the GOH.

**Table 3: Inventory of Educational texts and materials developed, and others needed for the EIB program**

| Language | Validated materials produced | Yet to be accomplished |
|---|---|---|
| Garífuna | Phonetic and syntactic agreements among dialects<br>Garífuna Grammar<br>Cartilla for reading-writing for first grade | Texts for preschool, first, second and third grade<br>Validate and reprint existing materials |
| Miskito | Phonetic and syntactic agreements among dialects<br>Miskito Grammar<br>Miskito Diccionary edited<br>Cartilla for first grade<br>Text for Teaching of Spanish as Second Language<br>Short Story Collection *"Kisinani"*<br>Coloring book in Miskito | Validate and reprint existing materials<br>Texts for preschool, second, third grade |
| Tol | Tol Grammar, validated<br>Cartilla for first grade<br>Cartilla in Spanish for Tol speakers<br>Dictionary in Tol<br>Reading Book *"Leamos Tol"*<br>Short Stories in Tol | Validate and reprint existing materials<br>Texts for preschool, first, second grade |
| Creole English | *"Historia de los Negros de habla inglesa"*<br>*"Chata Talk"* Reading text. | Decide whether Standard or Creole English will be used in grammar and texts<br>Validate and reprint existing materials<br>Texts for preschool, first, second grade |
| Tawahka | Phonetic and syntactic agreements among dialects<br>Tawahka Grammar<br>Tawahka Diccionary | Validate and reprint existing materials<br>Texts for preschool, first, second grade |
| Pech | Cartilla for first grade<br>Text for reading and writing in Pech | Validate and reprint existing materials<br>Pech Diccionary<br>Pech Grammar<br>Texts for preschool, first, second grade |
| Chortí | Drafted grammar incomplete | Grammar, dictionary, cartillas |
| Nahoa and lenca | Nothing | Discover language heritage. |

Source: EIB Unit at the SE, indigenous consultants and federations. Nov. 2000

**7. The case of Mosquitia and Bay Islands**

The Committee of Intercultural Bilingual Educators for the Honduran Mosquitia (CEBIMH) was locally formed in 1990 with financing from several NGOs. In 1993, Agreement 0782 was signed by SE and CEBIMH

for the administration of 20 EIB primary and 20 EIB preschools in Mosquitia. According to an evaluation carried out by CEBIMH in 1998, EIB schools show considerably better results than traditional schools (control group) in terms of number of graduates (third grade), and drop-out rates. No further evaluation has been done, and the efforts of CEBIMH have received little attention from the Secretariat of Education.

The SA team found that the great majority of children in the Departments of Gracias a Dios and Bay Islands are bilingual Miskito-Spanish or Creole English-Spanish respectively. Adults are partly trilingual Miskito-Garifuna-Spanish in several communities bordering Gracias a Dios and Colon; in Bay Islands Creole English-Garifuna-Spanish, or in Patuca Tawahka-Miskito-Spanish. Focus groups carried out in Palacio, Batalla, Limonal, (Mosquitia) indicated the particular need for EIB for the children and bilingual literacy education for the adults. Moreover, for the most part, adults indicated their consent to have children learn three languages to improve the probabilities to interact with other linguistic groups in a multicultural and multilingual environment. Focus groups with parents indicated the average number of children per woman is 6.5, and the average schooling is third grade. About 50% of school-age children do not have access to a school, and from those who attend school, more than 70% are over-aged for their grade. Most schools are multi-grade with one teacher. At the moment, all classes are taught in Spanish, although most children 3-6 year olds speak only their native language.

**8. The first Pilot Project PROHECO-EIB in Montaña de la Flor**

Approximately 6,370 Tolupan children are registered in 98 schools where Spanish is enforced and Tol has been discouraged in the past. There is only one Basic Center (1-9) and no High School in the entire Tolupan territory. At the moment, 22 ladino teachers have abandoned their traditional schools because of poor living conditions. The Tolupanes have historically preferred isolation rather than submission to the ladino man. Teachers and community members express their disenchantment with the Departmental and Distrital Education authorities who continue to ignore their special needs. The Consejos Directivos de Tribus are the traditional authorities which make the decisions for the tribes. The two Tolupan Caciques assist the Consejos. They have always expressed their need to preserve their almost extinct language (only 290 speak Tol), and cultural traits. Tolupan children attend school without shoes and with ragged clothing. They are notorious for poor hygiene. Their dwellings are made of bahareque and they use firewood for cooking. Upper respiratory infections, diarrhea and malnutrition are the main children's health problems. Attempts by FHIS and PROHECO have been successful in the past two years in reaching the chiefs and the tribes to offer them development opportunities.

As an initiative of the Coordination Unit of PROHECO, ten educational basic centers PROHECO-EIB are being built in 2000 as a pilot project, under the program "Mutual help", where the community's contribution is unskilled labor and local materials, and the PROHECO project puts the rest. These centers will include preschool and primary school. A dwelling for the teacher will be built adjacent to the school. Moreover, 50 Tolupan non-accredited teachers (sixth grade of schooling) are being trained in Bilingual Education Tol-Spanish through distance learning, to assist in those basic centers. What is needed, according to teachers is the elaboration and edition of Cartillas in Tol-Spanish for teachers as well as for students, and a systematized collection of Tol traditions and readings.

This pilot experience at the Montaña de la Flor needs to be evaluated and replicated in other villages.

**9. The proposed Intercultural Bilingual Program 2001-2005**

The EIB Unit and the WB preparation team recommend an Indigenous Peoples Development Plan, which will seek to facilitate the institutionalization and systematization of an EIB Program in the SE of Honduras. The plan includes: (i) the institutionalization of EIB in ethnic traditional schools; (ii) creation of PROHECO-EIB schools which include preschool; (iii) on-the-job teacher training for EIB Certification; (iv) piloting of ADEL-PEC program in PROHECO-EIB schools; (v) adaptation of the EIB curriculum based on the revised national basic curriculum; (vi) creation of the EIB student and teacher performance evaluation system; (vii) institutional arrangements for program administration at the central, department, district and local levels. A point of departure may be the validation of the pilot EIB program in Mosquitia, and the pilot PROHECO-EIB experience in Montaña de la Flor, where teachers were trained in EIB under the programs. In other EIB settings, bilingual teachers are self-trained in bilingual education.

**10. Objectives of the proposed Intercultural Bilingual Program**

(i) To provide quality education to the autochthonous peoples of Honduras with professionals trained in EIB and a culturally-appropriate curriculum adapted to the needs of the students.
(ii) To improve the learning school experience and results among ethnic groups.
(iii) To systematize the use of the local languages for meaningful academic instruction, adapting the national curriculum requirements to a culturally significant learning experience.
(iv) To graduate EIB teachers capable of participating in sustaining, improving and institutionalizing an EIB program that can adequately respond to the needs of the ethnic educational community.

**11. Institutional arrangements of PRONEEAAH and EIB at the SE**

At the central level, the GOH has agreed to the reorganization of the management Unit of EIB under a single Coordination (Unidad Técnica Central, UTC) called PRONEEAAH-EIB to be staffed by: one Unit Coordinator, three consultants (an Anthropologist, An Education Specialist, a Linguist), a Procurement/contract Specialist and a Team Assistant. The nine ethnic representatives (one per group) at the SE under PRONEEAAH would be reincorporated to their respective district units. At the Departmental level, the existing EIB Units (Unidades Técnicas Departamentales y Distritales) would be strengthened along with their EIB Volunteer Support Groups.

**12. Socio-cultural pertinence of PROHECO for EIB schools**

The multicultural and multilingual nature of EIB education requires a high level of locally-based management and community involvement, well organized and committed parent associations, and well established quality assurance and evaluation systems. The PROHECO system provides the setting and elements for an adequate operationalization of EIB in

multi-ethnic communities. PROHECO has been introduced to sixteen out of the eighteen departments in Honduras. The two departments left out, Gracias a Dios and Bay Islands, discussed above, require EIB education.

**13. Cultural heritage and a culturally-appropriate EIB curriculum**

The EIB program seeks to adapt the national curriculum to the cultural context of the learners. The content areas (Math, language, sciences, etc.) are the same. What changes is the language, manner of delivery, and areas of application. Arithmetic may be taught as applied to a farmer's seasonal activities, language may include local literature gathered from oral tradition, sciences may include materials and elements at hand reach. Successful international experiences of EIB in Alaska and Ecuador show the enriching experience of a locally-modeled curriculum where the cultural experiences of the adults are the vehicles for teaching the young social and scientific skills. Likewise, the native language of the preschooler is used as the vehicle for second language acquisition. The goal of EIB

**14. The imperative need of trained bilingual teachers for EIB**

An agreement will be signed by PROMEB and the Universidad Pedagógica de Honduras for On-the-Job Teacher Training Program for 1,500 teachers in four years. A certificate in Intercultural Bilingual Education will be provided after two-years of training. Instruction will be given on weekends. The Social Assessment recommends International support be obtained from universities granting EIB diplomas in Nicaragua (URACCAN), Bolivia, and Ecuador. Study tours and scholarships may be granted to autochthonous teachers to strengthen their skills.

**15. Lessons learned from attempts to implement EIB at the national level**

Ø The traditional education program (Spanish) has not been able to resolve the issue of poor educational attainment among bilingual indigenous population. The EIB program has proven to be more appropriate.
Ø The sustainability of the EIB program depends to a great extent on the commitment of stakeholders such as the indigenous specialists, leaders, federations, communities, department and district education authorities, to support the program.
Ø Specialization in teaching EIB school is a requirement for a successful EIB program. Being indigenous and speaking an ethnic language are not enough to teach EIB.
Ø In order to implement an EIB program, an EIB curriculum is needed. This curriculum must be adapted to the cultural framework of each language.
Ø Some EIB materials are being produced within each linguistic group. However, they need to be organized, validated, piloted and reproduced.

**16. Recommendations**

1. Carry out the institutional reorganization of the PRONEEAAH-EIB Unit at the central level, staffing it as indicated above.
2. Design a National Basic EIB Curriculum based on the national curriculum presently under revision, and adapt it to the linguistic and socio-cultural needs of each linguistic group. The design should be done with the collaboration of linguists, anthropologists and educators, the indigenous

federations, and the Departmental and District Education authorities.
3. Provide on-the-job training to 1,500 potential EIB teachers (local) on Teaching of EIB in culturally-bound environments. Also, provide internships and study tours for successful EIB teachers in other countries. Upon return, they can organize workshops to transfer knowledge acquired.
4. Assess and validate the existing materials (phonetic and syntactic agreements among dialects of each language, Cartillas for reading-writing, story books, grammar books and drafts) by means of consultancies of local and international experts. Print/reprint materials already validated.
5. Contract local and international experts for the research and writing of texts for preschool, first, second and third grades in EIB in the different languages.
6. Create PROHECO-EIB schools in hard-to-reach rural communities throughout the country and in the Departments of Gracias a Dios and Bay Islands, where PROHECO has not been introduced yet.
7. Introduce ADEL-PECs system in most PROHECO-EIB schools as an incentive for teachers and schools to sustain the program.
8. Create incentives for PROHECO teachers to live permanently in hard-to-reach *caserios*. Recommend the employer (the community) to provide housing/lodging and food incentives to keep the teacher in remote rural communities.
9. Launch a sensitivity campaign on EIB for the education community through the media, and for Education authorities at the Central, Departmental and District levels, as well as for teachers and parents.

**17 . Indigenous Peoples Development Action Plan**

In compliance with ILO's Article 169, the Constitution of Honduras, and the World Bank O.D. 4.20 on Indigenous Peoples, the proposed project will support the Intercultural Bilingual Program of the Secretariat of Education of Honduras. To that end, the following Action Plan has been agreed with the GOH as follows:

**Table 4: Action Plan for the Intercultural Bilingual Program 2001-2005**

| Components | Description | Type | Years | Cost US$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I.1 | Design National EIB curriculum | consultancies | 1-2 | 400,000 |
| I.2 | Design, printing and distribution of materials | contracts | 1-4 | 518,250 |
| I.3 | Quality assessment/adjustments/ instruments for evaluation | Consult/ workshops | 1-2 | 50,000 |
| I.4 | On-the-job Teacher Training Program (2-yr program) for 1,500 EIB teachers, and 300 EIB volunteers | contract | 1-3 | 960,000 |
| II.1.1 | Creation of 200 PROHECO-EIB Basic schools | | 1-5 | 2,369,595 |
| II.1.2 | PROHECO-EIB volunteers | | 1-5 | 532,590 |
| II.1.5 | Creation of 200 PROHECO-EIB preschool | | 1-5 | 536,920 |
| III.1.2 | Creation of 400 ADEL-EIB | | 1-4 | 80,000 |
| III.3.2 | Transfer to PECs for durable goods basic schools (1-9) | | 1-4 | 726,000 |
| III.3.3 | Transfer to PECs for durable goods pre school | | 1-4 | 240,000 |
| III.3.4 | Transfer to PECs for non-durable goods basic school (1-9) | | 1-5 | 86,400 |
| III.3.5 | Transfer to PECs for non-durable goods pre school | | 1-5 | 46,000 |
| IV-1 | Program Administration at SE | Contracts | 1-4 | 388,800 |
| **TOTAL** | | | | **6,934,555** |

The Plan described above has been agreed on with the Secretariat of Education, Government of Honduras, January 2001, and has been incorporated in the Honduras: Community-based Project (PO7397) to be financed by the World Bank.